

**SUPPORT FOR THE AMENDMENTS**

Certain claims have been cancelled without prejudice to the subject matter therein, solely for the purpose of avoiding an increase in fee payment.

Claim 53 is amended to point out more distinctly that "a metal", in contradistinction with the phrase "combination of metals" set forth in the original paragraph [050] of the present specification, means the same as "a single metal". It is also clear from the Examples that a single metal, as opposed to the bi-metallic species used in the Raja et al. reference, is used. Additional claims are amended in order to be consistent with this change, and also new Claims 107 and 108 are added, consistent with the original disclosure of paragraph [050]. The presence of a second single metal is provided in the disclosure by the proviso that "a mixture" of metals is allowed.

As required by MPEP 608.01(o), since the terminology "single" does not find explicit support in the specification, the specification is also amended in paragraph [050].

It is respectfully urged that these changes do not constitute new matter and entry is respectfully requested.

**REMARKS**

Claims 53-60, 62-68, and 70-96, 99-101, and 107-108 are in the case. All other claims have been cancelled.

Applicant's would like to thank Examiner Puttlitz for the very helpful and courteous discussion of October 10, 2008.

During the discussion, Applicant's urged that by amending the claims to read "a metal" and deleting the original phrase "or more" from the phrase "comprising one or more", Applicant's avoided the bi-metallic compound set forth by the Raja et al. reference (Raja et al., Angewandte Chemie, International Edition (2001), 40(24), 4638-4642, hereinafter "Raja"). This is because the specification, at paragraph [050] provides that the hydrogenation-dehydrogenation component be "a metal or combination of metals". In other words, by focusing on "a metal" in contradistinction to "combination of metals", it is believed that a bi-metallic compound is avoided.

While not wishing to indicate any guarantee on allowability, the Examiner indicated that he believed we should use the phrase "a single metal".

Accordingly, Applicant's amend the claims and also the specification in order to use the word "single" in the phrase "a single metal".

We believe that one of ordinary skill in the art would agree that there is support in the specification for the addition of this word, particularly in view of the use of a single metal in the Examples.

Thus, having clarified the meaning of the invention as presently claimed in accordance with the suggestion of the Examiner, it is clear that Raja does not fairly suggest the present invention, because Raja requires a bimetallic metal as hydrogenation-dehydrogenation component. The secondary references do not cure this deficiency, for the reasons set forth in the previous response.

For these reasons, it is respectfully requested that the rejections be withdrawn.

There being no further issues, it is believed that the application is in condition for allowance and early notice to this effect is earnestly solicited.

Respectfully submitted,

---

October 13, 2008

Date

---

/Andrew B. Griffis/

Andrew B. Griffis  
Attorney for Applicants  
Registration No. 36,336

Post Office Address (to which correspondence is to be sent):

ExxonMobil Chemical Company  
Law Technology Department  
P.O. Box 2149  
Baytown, Texas 77522-2149  
Phone: (281) 834-1886  
Fax: (281) 834-2495